

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-15 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out the applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the amendment and consideration of the remarks below, the application is in condition for allowance.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 1 has been objected to because of the phrase "said device" on line 7. The phrase: "said device" has been cancelled. Thus, this objection should be obviated.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. This rejection is based on the phrase "said server" in line 5. It is respectfully submitted that the phrase "said server" in line 5 has been deleted. Thus, the phrase "said server" in line 5 relates to the server identified in line 2. Accordingly, this rejection should be obviated.

Claim 1 has been rejected for allegedly failing to provide an enabling disclosure for claim 6. The basis for this rejection is as follows:

"The specification and drawings describe using a time code as a method of synchronization between broadcast programming and link data files. This time code is part of the data that is included with the video content. Therefore, the specification does include embedded tags in the form of time codes, which means the disclosure of the invention includes embedded tags."

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the video content does not include embedded tags relating to the pixel objects in the frames of the video content. As clearly set forth in paragraphs [0082] *et seq.* data relating to the pixel objects is not embedded in the video content. In particular, as set forth in the specification, data regarding the pixel objects and the frames of the video content are stored in the linked video files, separate from the video content. Based on the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 6.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9-12, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Berberet, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2005/0086703 A1 ("the Berberet, et al. reference"). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every one of the elements of the claim must be found in a single reference. It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite subject matter not disclosed or suggested by the Berberet, et al. reference. In particular, the claims recite a video interaction platform that is configured to enable a viewer to select a pixel object in the video content and link pixel objects selected by said user to alternate resource platforms. The Berberet, et al. reference relates to a system for providing broadcast programming to remote subscribers. In other words, the Berberet, et al. reference relates to a cable TV provider. It does not disclose or suggest a system which allows a viewer to select pixel objects and link the selected pixel objects to alternate resource platforms. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Berberet, et al. reference in view of Gerba, U.S. Patent No. 5,931,908 ("the Gerba, et al. patent"). These claims, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 all depend on claim 1. The Gerba, et al. patent has already been discussed. The Berberet, et al. reference is discussed above. The Gerba, et al. patent relates to live programming and the ability of an operator at a video head in to add content that is overlaid over the live video content. It does not disclose a system for enabling an end user to select pixel objects and one or more frames of video content wherein the pixel objects are linked to alternate resource platforms and stored. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.


Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Berberet, et al. reference in view of Gupta, et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0086703 A1 ("the Gupta, et al. reference"). Claim 13 is a dependent claim which depends upon claim 10, which, in turn, depends upon claim 1. The Berberet, et al. reference was discussed above. The Gupta, et al. reference relates to a multi-media player for playing video content. The Gupta, et al. reference does not otherwise allow the user of the multi-media video

player to select pixel objects within frames of the video content which are linked to alternate resource platforms. Accordingly, for this reason and the reasons submitted above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By:


John S. Paniaguas
Registration No. 31,051
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 W. Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Telephone: (312) 902-5200
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061